

## Message

**From:** John Lagerling [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**Sent:** 10/8/2013 8:53:27 PM  
**To:** Jamie Rosenberg [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**Subject:** Re: Wallet and DCB

for the record: agree with your points here

On Mon, Oct 7, 2013 at 10:43 PM, Jamie Rosenberg <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
 We want to use Play Billing for YT -- YT gave us some additional requirements which we don't yet support, so they went with a direct Wallet integration for their initial launch.

They've said that as soon as we support their requirements they'll migrate, particularly because of their interest in DCB. I've asked the team to work through a plan in Q4 so that we can get them migrated in Q1. Everybody is focused on that as a goal.

I would rather keep Play as the vehicle for DCB in this case, for the reasons you state and because it's a cleaner ecosystem story to have a first-party app using Play Billing on Android rather than a custom integration.

On Mon, Oct 7, 2013 at 2:24 PM, John Lagerling <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

- wallet-team don't want to do multiple integrations
- I certainly don't want to have multiple parallel DCB deals between Google and operators.
- YouTube can indeed legally piggyback on current DCB deal
- If we use PlayStore as framework for billing YouTube, it would likely help make it less of a strain on the carrier relation under existing DCB terms. What is the issue here? Who gets to count this as their incremental sale under their P&L?

I sense an aspiration from parts of Google to do more under DCB but we have to keep communicating with the carriers if it is beyond content services.

- john

On Fri, Oct 4, 2013 at 7:52 AM, Jamie Rosenberg <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

BTW, this is not about money or control. It puts us in a difficult position with our third-party ecosystem if we have a first-party app that doesn't use Play billing. I've articulated this concern to Shishir and he understands. YT is looking for a few additional features from our in-app billing system and we're working with them on a roadmap for that. I'd prefer to plan for success there rather than cultivating an alternative path. But yes, you and I discussed in the past and you felt that a content service sold through YouTube could be classified as "content" rather than an in-app purchase and so could be subject to the lower rev share.

On Fri, Oct 4, 2013 at 7:41 AM, Jamie Rosenberg <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

OK, I'll ask both wallet and YT. I fear that YT is trying to find reasons not to use Play's in-app billing for its premium services. DCB and gift cards are the main hook we have. I'm concerned about their ramping a parallel billing strategy.

On Oct 4, 2013 2:12 AM, "John Lagerling" <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

**EXHIBIT 799**

The only case I could think of is if YouTube wanted to piggy-back on our DCB deals. Legally they might be able to under the 6% txn-fee term.

Why don't we just ask the wallet team straight out?

On Oct 3, 2013 6:46 PM, "Jamie Rosenberg" <[REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
Hey John,

I'm hearing that the Wallet team is working on integrating DCB support into some of its non-Play billing flows. Do you know anything about this? Are these separate deals that Wallet is doing with carriers, or somehow included in the Android/Play deals?

Thx,

Jamie